

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION N	
10/774,150	02/06/2004	Michael Schwartz	26763-001 US NA	7291	
26691 75	90 12/28/2004	12/28/2004		EXAMINER	
POTTER ANDERSON & CORROON LLP ATTN: KATHLEEN W. GEIGER, ESO.			VALENTI, ANDREA M		
P.O. BOX 951 WILMINGTON, DE 19899-0951			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			3643		

DATE MAILED: 12/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

• .		n /				
	Application No.	Applicant(s)				
	10/774,150	SCHWARTZ, MICHAEL				
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Andrea M. Valenti	3643				
The MAILING DATE of this communication app Period for Reply	pears on the cover sheet with the	correspondence address				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.1 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a repl - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period of Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be y within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) d will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS fro , cause the application to become ABANDO	timely filed lays will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this communication. VED (35 U.S.C.§ 133).				
Status						
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 F	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>06 February 2004</u> .					
2a)☐ This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This						
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is						
closed in accordance with the practice under E	Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11,	453 O.G. 213.				
Disposition of Claims	·					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are pending in the application 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdra 5)□ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-20</u> is/are rejected. 7)□ Claim(s) is/are objected to. 8)□ Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	wn from consideration.					
Application Papers						
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acc Applicant may not request that any objection to the Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examine	epted or b) objected to by the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. Stion is required if the drawing(s) is a	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119						
12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority document 2. Certified copies of the priority document 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority document application from the International Burea * See the attached detailed Office action for a list	es have been received. Es have been received in Applicative documents have been received in Received in Received in Received in Rule 17.2(a)).	ation No ived in this National Stage				
Attachment(s) 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail 5) Notice of Informa 6) Other:					

Art Unit: 3643

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 9-12, 15, 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,349,780 to Dyke.

Regarding Claim 1, Dyke teaches an apparatus assembly comprising: (a) a tubular metal pipe or conduit having an upper end and a lower end (Dyke Fig. 3 #30 and Col. 1 line 17 and 37-39); (b) an enclosing device (Dyke #108) removably engaged with said upper end of the tubular pipe or conduit, and, (c) a tapered stopper (Dyke #88 and 80) removably engaged with said lower end of the tubular metal pipe or conduit.

Regarding Claim 2, Dyke teaches a means for connecting (Dyke #1 #60) the tubular metal pipe or conduit to a tree.

Regarding Claims 5 and 15, Dyke teaches the tubular metal pipe or conduit has a length ranging from about 6 to about 15 feet (Dyke Col. 3 line 3).

Regarding Claims 9 and 20, Dyke teaches the tubular pipe or conduit has apertures (Dyke Fig. 3 #34).

Regarding Claim 10, Dyke teaches a process for making the apparatus of claim 1 comprising: (j) engaging an enclosing device (Dyke Fig. 3 #108) with an upper end of a tubular metal pipe or conduit, (ii) engaging a tapered stopper (Dyke Fig. 3 #88) with a

Art Unit: 3643

lower end of the tubular metal pipe or conduit, and, optionally (iii) providing a means for connecting the tubular metal pipe or conduit to a tree (Dyke Fig. 1 #60).

Regarding Claim 11, Dyke teaches an apparatus assembly comprising: (a) a tubular metal pipe or conduit (Dyke Fig. 4 #32) having an upper end (Dyke Fig. 4 #36) and a flattened lower end (Dyke Fig. 4 #44), and (b) a cap (Dyke Fig. 4 #108) removably engaged with said upper end of the tubular pipe or conduit.

Regarding Claim 12, Dyke teaches (c) a means for connecting the tubular metal pipe or conduit to an immature tree (Dyke Fig. 1).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 13, 14, 16, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,349,780 to Dyke.

Regarding Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 13, 14, 16, 17, Dyke is silent on the tubular metal pipe or conduit has a diameter ranging from about ½ inch to about 1 inch; a diameter of about 0.922 inches; a gauge ranging from 15-19. However, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Dyke at the time of the invention since the modifications are merely a change in size and thickness of material. This modification is merely an engineering manufacturing design choice selected to meet certain engineering design parameters such as cost. The gauge and the diameter

Art Unit: 3643

also depend on the size of the plant and the plant variety being supported. A dogwood tree would require a different gauge and diameter then a tomato plant. The decision could be made on the availability of raw materials and the climate conditions where the device will be put into practice [*Leshin* 125 UPSQ 416 and *In re Rose*, 220 F.2d 459, 463, 105 USPQ 237, 240 (CPA 1955)].

Claim 8 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,349,780 to Dyke in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,122,859 to Lazar.

Regarding Claims 8 and 19, Dyke teaches string and element #60, but is silent on the means for connection is an elastic ribbon. However, Lazar teaches an elastic ribbon for connecting a support post to a tree (Lazar abstract). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Dyke with the teachings of Lazar at the time of the invention for the advantage of limited mobility of the plant limb relative to the support member as taught by Lazar (Lazar Col. 1 line10-11).

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,349,780 to Dyke in view of U.S. Patent No. 249,803 to Sparks.

Regarding Claim 18, Dyke is silent on the tapered stopper being solid. However, Sparks teach a support post with a solid tapered stopper (Sparks Fig. 2 element B). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to modify the teachings of Dyke at the time of the invention with the teachings of Sparks since the modification is

Art Unit: 3643

merely an manufacturing design choice selected for a more durable ground insertion point.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Japanese Patent JP60232028; U.S. Patent Des. 293,874; U.S. Patent No. 1,984,265; U.S. Patent No. 3,345,774; U.S. Patent No. 6,516,561; U.S. Patent No. 1,031,941.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea M. Valenti whose telephone number is 703-305-3010. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30am-5pm M-F; Alternating Fridays Off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Peter M. Poon can be reached on 703-308-2574. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

Art Unit: 3643

Page 6

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov.

Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the

Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Andrea M. Valenti Andrea M. Valenti Patent Examiner Art Unit 3643

22 December 2004

Peter M. Poon

Supervisory Patent Examiner Technology Center 3600